

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This paper is in response to the Non-Final Office Action of May 24, 2006. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-7, 9-10, and 12-22 are in condition for allowance.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 7, 9, 16-19, 21 and 22 were rejected as being unpatentable over Tsuria (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,242) in view of Anand et al. (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0191793) and in view of Vu et al. (US Patent No. 6,557,104). This rejection is traversed in light of the arguments contained herein.

Applicant believes that combination of Tsuria, Anand et al., and Vu et al do not teach all of the elements of the claimed invention. The Examiner relies on the teaching of Tsuria where an IRD encoding signals for a digital VCR is compared to the hub and data storage device in Applicant's claimed invention. However, Tsuria is silent as to the claimed element, "an installed system tray program configured to allow customization of hub features." The Examiner indicates Column 9, Lines 1-14 of Tsuria teaches the "installed system tray program configured to allow customization of hub features." Applicant respectfully disagrees because Column 9, Lines 1-14 of Tsuria teaches the storing of an unchanging security element on a removable element such as a smart card. The cited portions of Tsuria further elaborate a well-known method to write the unchanging security element to a replacement smart card. Applicant believes "an installed system tray program configured to allow customization of hub features" is distinguishable from the teachings of Tsuria at

Column 9, Lines 1-14, as Tsuria does not allow any customization since the security element remains unchanged.

If the Examiner wishes to maintain the rejection Applicant respectfully requests an explanation of how the storing and copying of an unchanging security element on a removable element is analogous to an "installed system tray program configured to allow customization of hub features." Furthermore, the cited portions of Anand et al. and Vu et al. fail to cure the deficiencies of Tsuria. Because the combination of Tsuria, Anand et. al, and Vu et al. does not teach all elements of Applicant's claimed invention Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejection to claims 1, 7, 9, 16-19, 21 and 22.

Claims 1, 5-6, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuria (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,242), in view of Anand et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0191793), and in view of Veil et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,092,202. This rejection is traversed in light of the arguments herein. As argued above, the cited portions of the publications do not contain all of the elements of Applicant's claimed invention. Particularly, the cited publications fail to teach, "an installed system tray program configured to allow customization of hub features". Because the combination of Tsuria, Anand et. al, and Veil et al. does not teach all elements of Applicant's claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the objection and believes that claims 1, 5-6, 10 and 12 are in a condition for allowance.

The remaining rejections are toward dependent claims 2-4, 13, 14, 15 and 20 that are directly or indirectly dependent to independent claims 1, 10 and 16. The remaining rejections are based on the combined teachings of at least Tsuria and Anand et al. in addition to a variety of other publication. The cited portions of the

additional publications fail to cure the deficiencies found in Tsuria, specifically the failure to teach, "an installed system tray program configured to allow customization of hub features". Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the removal of the rejections as claims 2-4, 13, 14, 15, and 20 are in a condition for allowance.

**SUMMARY**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present Amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 774-6911. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ADAPP201A). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Konrad K. Chan, Esq.  
Reg. No. 57,878

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP  
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
Tel: (408) 749-6900  
Customer No. 25920